

MINUTES

CITY PLAN COMMISSION/ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

APRIL 21, 2008

The City Plan Commission/Architectural Review Board of the City of Clayton, Missouri, met upon the above date at 5:30 p.m., Chairman Harold Sanger presiding. Upon roll call, the following responded:

Present

Harold Sanger, Chairman
Steve Lichtenfeld, Aldermanic Representative
Lenore Toser-Aldaz, Deputy City Manager
Jim Liberman
Marc Lopata
Scott Wilson

Absent:

Debbie Igielnik

Also Present:

Catherine Powers, Director of Planning & Development Services
Jason Jaggi, Planner
Kevin O'Keefe, City Attorney

Chairman Sanger welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked that conversations not take place during the meeting and that all cell phone and pager ringers be turned off.

MINUTES

The minutes of the regular meeting of April 7th, 2008 were presented for approval. The minutes were approved, after having been previously distributed to each member.

Catherine Powers stated that the agenda will be re-arranged so as to get the smaller projects out of the way first.

SITE PLAN REVIEW AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW - NEW CONSTRUCTION – SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE – 511 W. POLO

Ms. Lauren Strutman, project architect, was in attendance at the meeting. She introduced Kris McCurdy, developer and Larry Wurm, Civil Engineer, to the members.

Catherine Powers explained that the project consists of a 2-story, 4,917 square foot 30 feet in height brick, stone and stucco single-family residence with a three-car rear entry garage. The site

measures approximately 27,580 square feet and is located in the Country Club Place Subdivision, with an R-2 Zoning designation. The R-2 Single Family Dwelling District allows up to 55% impervious coverage. The plans indicate that the existing impervious coverage is 13,535 square feet or approximately 49% of the site. The new plans show impervious coverage at 9,069 square feet or 32.8% of the site. The applicant is proposing to remove the tennis court, which accounts for the reduction of impervious surface. The existing front circle drive is proposed to remain. The applicant is proposing to install three downspout laterals with pop-ups in the rear yard. The driveway and rear turnaround will be constructed of pervious pavers to allow storm water infiltration. The Public Works Department has reviewed this site plan and requests that the pop-ups be adjusted away from the property lines; otherwise, Public Works finds the storm water mitigation plans acceptable. Trash storage on the civil site plan is within an enclosure behind the garage and screened with a wood fence. The HVAC units are shown on the site plan to the rear of the house and screened with a wood lattice fence. The plan shows 112 caliper inches of trees to be removed. The applicant is proposing 113-inches of replacement trees. The applicant is proposing to preserve and protect 29 trees, several of which are mature trees. Catherine indicated that the impervious coverage on the lot represents a significant decrease in impervious coverage compared to the existing improvements. A storm sewer connection is not available near this site. In lieu of a connection, the applicant is removing the tennis court, installing permeable pavers, and directing runoff to flow toward the back yard. There are no residences to the rear of this property, which would create an impact. As previously indicated, a revised site plan should be submitted which shows the pop-ups adjusted away from the side property lines. Staff believes the impervious coverage, storm water mitigation, and setbacks are in conformance with the R-2 Single Family Zoning Ordinance requirements and recommends approval with the conditions that the pop-ups be relocated further away from the side property line and that the City's Tree Protection Standards be followed for all remaining trees.

Ms. Strutman presented a site plan and landscape plan to the members. She stated that impervious coverage will be reduced as a result of this project and that some of the existing driveway is to remain. She stated they are happy to relocate the pop-ups more towards the center of the lot. She stated that 112 caliper inches of trees are to be removed with 113 caliper inches being planted.

Jim Liberman asked about the removal of the tennis court.

Ms. Strutman stated that the area will become lawn.

Jim Liberman asked about the fence around the tennis court.

Ms. Strutman indicated that, too, will be removed.

Marc Lopata advised Ms. Strutman that the asphalt can be re-cycled.

Ms. Strutman agreed.

Being no further questions or comments from the members and none from the audience, Steve Lichtenfeld made a motion to approve the site plan per staff recommendations. The motion was seconded by Marc Lopata and unanimously approved by the members.

The architectural aspects of the project were now up for review.

Catherine Powers explained that the proposed residence will be constructed of brick and stone with stucco accents. In conformance with the Architectural Review Guidelines, the amount of stucco does not exceed 25% on any elevation. Windows will be casement; clay in color. A rear-entry three car garage is proposed. The driveway and turnaround is proposed to be pervious pavers. The color of the pavers has not been specified. The roofing material will be architectural shingle. The color has not been specified. Trash will be located in an enclosure behind the garage and screened with wood fence. The HVAC units are located on the back of the house and screened with a wood lattice fence. Catherine stated that compared to the existing residence, the proposed residence will have a high degree of street presence. The streetscape drawing shows two-story homes to the south and to the north. Staff has concerns with proposed roof material and the finials. The roofing should be upgraded to appropriately match the design and the finials should be removed to be more respectful of the character of neighborhood. Incorporating these changes, staff believes the proposed residence represents a quality design which will compliment the area and therefore, recommends approval with the following conditions:

1. That the roofing material be upgraded to a Slate-line or other material for Architectural Review Board approval; and
2. That the finials be eliminated.

Catherine Powers indicated that in discussing staff's concerns with the developer, it was determined that other homes in the neighborhood have finials and as such, staff is less concerned with incorporating them into the design

Ms. Strutman presented a color rendering to the members. She stated that it is a European style structure. She presented samples of the proposed roofing material (Grand Manor shingle that imitates slate), tumbled stone (EW Gold), brick (tan to match stone), window (dark tan), stucco and cast stone.

Chairman Sanger asked about the "Xs".

Ms. Strutman indicated they are a decorative brick band. Elevation drawings were presented. Ms. Strutman stated that many homes on Polo Drive contain small copper spires (finials) as proposed here.

Scott Wilson asked if they are lightening rods.

Ms. Strutman replied "yes". She stated that they are incorporating them for decorative purposes.

Steve Lichtenfeld commented that the house has great character and that he has no problem with the finials.

Marc Lopata asked the R value of the windows.

Ms. Strutman indicated that the windows are argon gas Low E glass.

Mr. John Heuser, 509 W. Polo, stated that he has concerns with the proposed project as follows: 1) that it will be the most expensive house on the street and as such, believes it may not sell. He stated the house should have been more conservative. 2) that the house is over-proportioned with the yard and 3) that the yard is no longer desirable due to the noise from the Parkway, 170 and Meramec School's HVAC system. He stated that no one will want to sit on the outside deck due to noise.

Ms. Steve Kissel, 520 W. Polo, stated that he is concerned with the proposed roofing material. He stated the houses on the north and south of the subject property have true slate roofs. He stated he has no problem with the brick. He stated he, too, believes this is too much house for the lot. He asked that the Magnolia tree on his side be saved and that the dead tree in the front yard must come down before it causes damage to his house. He reiterated that the house needs a slate roof as the roof is a predominate feature of the structure.

Catherine Powers indicated that staff also has a concern with the use of asphalt shingle.

Ms. Strutman stated that the proposed roofing material is more expensive and looks better than slate-line.

Mr. McCurdy advised the members that there are several homes on Polo that have asphalt shingle roofs. He informed the members that all three Trustees support this project.

Being no further questions or comments, Jim Liberman made a motion to approve as submitted. The motion was seconded by Scott Wilson and received the following vote: Ayes: Chairman Sanger, Steve Lichtenfeld, Lenore Toser-Aldaz, Jim Liberman, and Scott Wilson. Nays: Marc Lopata.

SIGNAGE SUB-DISTRICT-DEMUN POINTE-6451 CLAYTON ROAD

Tyler Stephens, Core 10 Architecture, was in attendance at the meeting.

Catherine Powers indicated that this is consideration of a request by OPD, LLC, owner, for the establishment of a sign sub-district for the DeMun Pointe building. The applicant has developed sign specifications for commercial tenants on the ground floor of The DeMun Pointe building and building identification at each end of the structure. Section 5-30.3 H (3) of the City's Sign Ordinance states: *"A district or sub-district may develop a uniform series of coordinated signs but the plan must be approved by the Architectural Review Board."* Each designated tenant space will be allowed the following types of signage:

Awning and Signage

The primary signage for tenant businesses are fabric awnings sloping above the store front window. The awnings will be black sunbrella with white translucent letters affixed to the fabric. Lettering and logos may cover no more than 65% of the awning area. The awnings will be backlit to shine through the lettering on the awning.

Window Sign

The window ID sign would allow the tenant, as an option to apply a sign band to the interior of the storefront window. The band will be 8 inches in height with letter contained within the signage strip.

Address ID

Each tenant will display an address in vinyl white letters to the entry door to the establishment. Letters must be a minimum of 4 inches in height to meet code requirements.

In addition to tenant signage, the building itself will be identified as follows:

Building ID Sign

The building ID signs are at the entry to the building at each building end. The signs are located on the brick wall and are 8 square feet each. Material of the letters is stainless steel.

Catherine indicated that staff believes that the proposed sign specifications for the DeMun Pointe building are appropriate for a first floor retail environment. It is our opinion that the coordination of signage will ensure the quality appearance of the building. Because these signs represent the establishment of a sign sub-district, the sign specifications, as presented, will govern all future tenant signage on the building. All signs must receive a Sign Permit from the City prior to installation. Staff's recommendation is to approve the sign sub-district for the DeMun Pointe building with the following conditions:

1. That the landlord advise tenants of the sign standards for the building and include such language in the lease; and
2. That the tenants receive a Sign Permit prior to the installation of the signs to ensure conformance with the sub-district standards.

Catherine indicated that the signage is similar to that of The Crescent building.

Chairman Sanger asked if the plans represent accurate tenants.

Mr. Stephens replied "no".

Chairman Sanger asked about the awnings.

A sample of the fabric was presented. He stated that the lettering will be cut out of the fabric and translucent letters incorporated into the cut-outs.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked if there will be any light spillover.

Mr. Stephens indicated that the only spillover would be off the black awning down onto the sidewalk, which will be minimal.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked about the cursive "P" within "DeMun Pointe" at the corner.

Mr. Stephens stated that it is their logo and will be cursive.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked if it will be back-lit.

Mr. Stephens replied “no”.

Being no further questions or comments, Steve Lichtenfeld made a motion to approve per staff recommendations. The motion was seconded by Scott Wilson and unanimously approved by the Board.

Chairman Sanger reminded Mr. Stephens that each tenant will be required to apply for and receive a Sign Permit.

SIGNAGE AND EXTERIOR LIGHTING – 8000 MARYLAND

Mr. Troy Guzman with Arcturis, contractor, was in attendance at the meeting.

Catherine Powers explained that this is a request by DHR International, owner, for review of the design and materials associated with the installation of a monument sign and accent lighting at 8000 Maryland Avenue. The proposed monument sign will be located on Maryland Avenue near the intersection with Meramec Avenue. The 24.5 square foot monument sign will be two-sided made of fabricated aluminum with routed out and pushed through acrylic letters. “DHR International” and the DHR logo will be prominently displayed on the upper portion of the sign on the aluminum cabinet. Space for future tenant names will be provided on a white background within the proposed brown granite portion of the sign. The base of the sign is proposed as concrete. The sign will be internally illuminated. In addition to the ground sign, DHR is requesting permission for blue LED lighting at the top cove of the building. The brightness of the lighting will match the existing white lights already in place. Catherine indicated that staff believes the design of the monument sign is of high quality and functional; however, staff has concerns regarding the color of the granite and the use of concrete for the base. Staff would prefer a granite or stone base and black granite color in keeping with the building façade. The Architectural Review Board has approved accent lighting at the top of other buildings in the Central Business District. Since this is a change from existing white lights to DHR blue lights, the effect will be neutral. Staff recommends approval with the following conditions:

3. That the base of the sign be granite or stone in lieu of a concrete base;
4. That landscaping be planted at the base of the sign; and
5. That the brown granite background be changed to black granite to better match the building.

Mr. Guzman informed the members that the granite has been changed to black per staff’s recommendations. He presented a sample of the blue DHR color.

Chairman Sanger asked how the monument sign will be illuminated.

Mr. Guzman stated that it will be internally (within cabinet) illuminated with fluorescent lights. He stated the base of the sign is very low, at 6", and that they will incorporate low plantings at the sign base. He stated that the proposed monument sign is in the same location as the previous monument sign.

Jim Liberman asked if the building sign that reads "Fifth Third Center" will remain.

Mr. Guzman replied "yes". He stated it is their desire to retain this sign.

Jason Jaggi stated that staff was unaware of the desire to retain that building sign, but if that is the name of the building, then it can remain.

Being no further questions or comments, Scott Wilson made a motion to approve per staff recommendations. The motion was seconded by Marc Lopata and unanimously approved by the Board.

SIGNAGE – PEOPLE'S NATIONAL BANK – 7600 FORSYTH BLVD.

Ms. Karen Setten with People's National Bank was in attendance at the meeting.

Catherine Powers explained that the applicant is proposing to install a 14.7 square foot sign at the arch of the building. The sign will contain the initials for People's National Bank using aluminum reverse channel letters, bronze in color. While this sign is located above the ceiling of the first floor, staff believes the location is appropriate because the space between the first and second floors is too small to accommodate signage. Additionally, the building is only two stories in height which limits the sign exposure. The applicant is also requesting an approximately 10 square foot, two-sided monument sign featuring an aluminum cabinet with natural satin finish brass lettering and logo. The sign will be up-lit from the ground and have a stone base. Decorative cast iron detail work at the top and posts will add to the aesthetic quality. Catherine stated that the proposed signs meet the regulations of the City's Sign Ordinance and that staff recommends approval as submitted.

Ms. Setten presented a sample of the decorative post that will match the building's staircase and a sample of the base for the ground sign.

Chairman Sanger asked if the signage meets Code.

Catherine Powers replied "yes".

Being no further questions or comments, Steve Lichtenfeld made a motion to approve as submitted. The motion was seconded by Scott Wilson and unanimously approved by the Board.

ROOFTOP ANTENNAS – WINDSOR BUILDING – 7711 BONHOMME

Mr. Steve Walters with Cricket Communications was in attendance at the meeting.

Catherine Powers explained that the applicant is proposing to install four antennas on the roof of the subject building. The two (2) antennas on the north elevation will be completely

screened by the parapet wall. The antennas located on the north and east elevations will be visible above the roof line. To mitigate, the antenna will be placed in a canister, painted to match the penthouse wall. Staff believes that, while not a preferred solution, the antenna placement in a canister will not have a detrimental impact on the building and recommends approval as submitted.

Chairman Sanger asked if more antennas are being added.

Mr. Walters replied “no”; he stated the owner is not happy with the antennas placed there previously by Cingular Wireless. He stated that the proposed antennas are 4’ tall and 6.5” in diameter.

Marc Lopata asked how they are to be installed.

Mr. Walters indicated that they are to be ballast mounted; he stated they only weigh 20 lbs.

Being no further questions or comments, Steve Lichtenfeld made a motion to approve as submitted. The motion was seconded by Jim Liberman and unanimously approved by the members.

OUTDOOR DINING – MORTON’S STEAKHOUSE – 212 S. CENTRAL AVE./7822 BONHOMME

Mr. Rob Lappe, architect on behalf of Morton’s, was in attendance at the meeting.

Catherine Powers explained that the applicant is proposing to operate outdoor dining, consisting of 10 tables with 32 seats, on a raised patio on the front of the restaurant along Bonhomme Avenue. Catherine stated the proposed tables are brown aluminum with tan colored Plexiglas tops. Chairs are brown aluminum to match the tables and burgundy umbrellas (sunbrella material) are also proposed. Catherine indicated that the new patio is located completely on private property. The brick wall and decorative lighting is attractive and serves as a pedestrian barrier. Catherine stated that staff’s recommendation is to approve with the conditions that the applicant apply for and receive the annual Outdoor Dining Permit prior to operation of the outdoor dining and that the umbrellas not contain lettering or advertising.

Mr. Lappe advised the members that the tables are 30 and 36” square; not round and that they are made of reinforced fiberglass, not Plexiglas.

Chairman Sanger commented that the concrete slopes to the street and questioned how outdoor dining can be accommodated.

Mr. Lappe stated that a new, level deck will be constructed.

Jim Liberman asked if the sign will be raised.

Mr. Lappe replied “yes”.

Being no further questions or comments, Steve Lichtenfeld made a motion to approve per staff recommendations. The motion was seconded by Scott Wilson and unanimously approved by the Board.

PUBLIC HEARING, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, SITE PLAN REVIEW & ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – NEW CONSTRUCTION – MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT – 25, 103, 111 & 119 NORTH CENTRAL (RJ YORK HOTEL PROJECT)

Tyler Stephens, project architect, was in attendance at the meeting. Also in attendance was Rob Kramer of RJ York.

Catherine Powers read staff's memorandum and recommendations with regard to the Planned Unit Development aspect of the project in its entirety as follows:

This project will be a hotel/residential/retail mixed-use project to be constructed in two phases as follows:

PHASE 1:

Phase 1 will be constructed first and will consist of a 6-level garage structure with three levels below grade and three levels above grade. The garage will contain 390 parking spaces; 87 spaces for public parking and 303 spaces for the hotel and retail parking use. Replacement of church parking will be shared with the hotel parking. The garage will be accessed from Central Avenue. This Phase will also include 18,420 square feet of ground floor retail/restaurant space. The retail and office portion will face Maryland Avenue.

PHASE 2:

Plans for Phase 2 consist of a 23 story hotel/condominium tower on the southwest corner of Central and Maryland Avenues. The hotel will provide 225 rooms, 10,500 square feet of meeting space, a 4,400 square feet restaurant, 5,580 square feet of ground floor retail, 3,100 square foot spa, and 180 square foot gift shop. This Phase also includes 40 condominium units. Eighty-five (85) parking spaces for the condominium units are located beneath the building.

COMPLIANCE WITH THE MASTER PLAN

This project is in compliance with the Business Districts Master Plan for Action Area #2 – Retail/Mixed-Use Core, as follows:

Future Function of Area:

To serve the retail and service needs of Clayton's residents, visitors and daytime employment population in a manner that addresses the street-level pedestrian environment.

Development Objectives:

- Retain and improve this area's pedestrian scale retail environment.
- Promote infill or new development that enhances the above objective.
- Retail/service uses on the ground level of buildings facing the street and extending to the sidewalk. This development could be new, rehab, or infill provided it conforms to and enhances the retail/mixed-use core's pedestrian environment.
- Upper levels may be mixed (office/residential/hotel).

Public Actions:

- Revise/update the C-4 Central Business District and related planning and design standards in the zoning code to provide guidance and incentives for the creation of an active and exciting street level shopping and pedestrian environment with offices, hotel and residential uses above.
- Strict code enforcement is needed to ensure the appearance, safety, and value of many of the aging structures and improvements in this action area.
- Streetscape/signage improvements.
- Provide tax and site consolidation incentives to achieve reinvestment objectives.
- Create a small pedestrian circulation plan which takes advantage of mid-block/alley walkways and other features that facilitate and encourage pedestrian traffic and exploration.

This project meets the objectives of the Master Plan by replacing an obsolete building and inefficient parking lots with a mixed-use project that provides additional parking and a pedestrian activity area, which will be located in front of the hotel on Central Avenue. The hotel and residential component meets the criteria of the "Development Objectives" which states that "Upper levels may be mixed (office/residential/hotel)".

ZONING AMENDMENT

The Zoning Amendment to change the two northernmost parking lots from R-3 to C-2 received a unanimous vote from the Plan Commission at their March 3rd meeting. Additionally, the Plan Commission voted to recommend that the entire project site be rezoned to a Planned Unit Development District. Both re-zonings will be considered by the Board of Aldermen at a public hearing for final decision.

PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT

The Zoning Ordinance stipulates that Planned Unit Developments are a distinct zoning district. The Planned Unit Development district is intended to provide a means for the redevelopment of an area in a unified land development that will improve the quality of the subject properties and have a beneficial effect on adjacent residential areas.

This project meets the criteria for Planned Unit Development pursuant to Chapter 22 (Zoning Ordinance), Article 22 (General Commercial District), Section 22.9 (Planned Unit Development) as follows:

A development proposal shall be eligible for consideration under the Planned Unit Development option per the provisions of Article 12 when the development incorporates two of the following three categories of use:

- a) office use
- b) retail use
- c) residential use

and exceeds the maximum height or maximum FAR requirements of the C-2 District.

Although Phase 1 does not exceed height or Floor Area Ratio (FAR), it is being considered as part of a total project which does exceed FAR and height. Phase 2 of the project meets the criteria of Chapter 22A (Overlay and Urban Design Zoning Districts), Article 3a.5 (Planned Unit Development) as follows:

A development proposal shall be eligible for consideration under the Planned Unit Development option per the provisions of Chapter 22 when the development incorporates two of the following three categories of use:

- a) office use
- b) retail use
- c) residential use
- d) Public parking (as defined in these regulations)

and exceeds the maximum FAR requirements of the CBD Core Overlay District.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN

This project seeks relief from Floor Area Ratio (FAR) and height. The base zoning maximum FAR for both the CBD Overlay and C-2 phases of the project is 1.5. The entire project, as proposed, has a FAR of 4.87.

The CBD Core Overlay District, which encompasses the hotel phase of the project, has a maximum height restriction of 4 stories. This height restriction may be waived through the Planned Unit Development Process; however, if height is waived, there must be 15 foot step-back at the third story or other step-back as approved by the Plan Commission. This project will require a PUD modification to build a 23-story structure; 18 stories higher than allowed by the underlying zoning. The project will also need a waiver from the rear yard setback requirement for the hotel.

The public benefits to the City that are intended to be derived from the approval of the development plan include, but are not limited to the following:

- Architectural distinction and significance that would make the development noteworthy;
- Extensive use of high quality building materials that would add significant value to the property and benefit adjacent properties;
- Provision of new public infrastructure including, but not limited to streets, curbs, sidewalks, sanitary sewers, storm water sewers, lighting and public parking;
- Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design (LEED) certification from the U.S. Green Building Council to promote sustainable building design and construction including but not limited to, sustainable site development, green roofs, water savings, energy efficiency, materials selection, and indoor environmental quality.

For projects proposed within the Central Business District, the public benefits specific to the Central Business District that are intended to be derived from the approval of planned unit developments include, but are not limited to the following accessory complimentary features:

- Inclusion of below grade public parking facility located underneath the proposed development;
- Public art;
- Architectural distinction and significance that would make the building(s) noteworthy;
- Extensive use of high quality building materials that would add to the assessed valuation of the structure.

Staff is of the opinion that this project meets the above stated criteria.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

To approved the Planned Unit Development with the following conditions:

1. That a plat showing all boundary adjustments and revisions to public infrastructure be approved by the Plan Commission and Board of Aldermen when the timing is appropriate.
2. That streetscape is installed per City specification.
3. That curbs and crosswalks be designed per City of Clayton standards.
4. That all recommendations of the Traffic Study as contained in the Site Plan Review Memo be implemented.

5. That the developer work with the City's Art Commission to provide public art for the project. Such art is to be approved by the City's Architectural Review Board prior to installation and Occupancy Permits.
6. That Fire Department access and fire hydrant installation is resolved prior to Building Permit issuance.
7. That the developer commit to LEED Certification.

Chairman Sanger asked Catherine to provide an overview of the approvals being sought this evening.

Catherine Powers explained that the first order of business is to conduct a public hearing with regard to the Planned Unit Development (PUD) portion of the approval process. She stated that the final decision regarding the PUD lies with the Board of Aldermen at a future hearing. She stated that the final decision regarding the site plan and architectural review portions of the approval process lies with this Commission/Board.

Chairman Sanger asked if only Phase 1 is being considered this evening.

Catherine Powers replied "no"; the entire project is being considered this evening.

Steve Lichtenfeld made a motion to open the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Marc Lopata and unanimously approved by the members.

Mr. Kramer stated that RJ York has been in business for 10 years and that they specialize in high-end residential projects. He stated they have been working on this project for about 1 ½ years and that they currently own the land where the hotel will be located (25 N. Central). He stated that they have received contract terms from hotels including Westin and Meridian and are working with Starwood Developers. He indicated that the garage will not begin until the hotel is finalized and that there is a sense of urgency. He stated that all will benefit from this project.

Mr. Stephens indicated that he recollects that at the last presentation, more detail regarding the hotel building was requested by the members. Mr. Stephens presented an aerial view of the subject properties, stating there are three land owners: RJ York, the City of Clayton (surface lot) and the Archdiocese of St. Louis. A slide depicting the existing sites was presented. He stated Phase 1 is the garage structure (to accommodate 390 vehicles) to include retail along Maryland Avenue. He indicated that based on feedback, the office portion of the structure has been eliminated so the south side of the garage is only two stories now. He stated Phase 2, the hotel, will be located across Maryland. He stated that he believes they have created good pedestrian access across the street. He indicated that the hotel structure will contain parking (85 spaces) for the condominium owners only as well as 5,580 square feet of retail. He stated that an external lobby has been created to allow relief for pedestrians. He stated the hotel's main lobby will be on the second level and that the 3rd level has been stepped back. He indicated that the changes made to the project since the previous proposal is the reduction of 30 parking spaces due to the loss of office space.

Chairman Sanger asked if procedurally, it is acceptable to keep the public hearing open throughout the presentation.

Kevin O’Keefe replied “yes”.

Mr. Stephens asked that the public hearing only remain open throughout the PUD and Site Plan Review portions of the presentation, as the architectural aspects are opinionated.

Chairman Sanger stated he would prefer the public hearing remain open throughout the entire presentation process.

Note: Marc Lopata left the meeting (6:40 p.m.).

Catherine Powers read the Site Plan and Architectural Review Board staff memorandums and recommendations in their entirety as follows:

Site Plan: The subject property is zoned C-2 “General Commercial District. The proposed Phase I of the project consists of a 390 space parking garage, accessed from Central Avenue and, 18,420 square feet of retail/restaurant space facing Maryland Avenue. Phase II consists of a 23 story mixed use building featuring a hotel, 40 condominium units, ground floor retail, spa, meeting rooms and 85 parking spaces below grade. The current impervious coverage is 91.7% and the proposed impervious coverage is 92.3%. The increase in impervious coverage is minimal. Drainage for the garage will be connected to the storm sewer on Central Avenue. The hotel will be connected to the storm sewer on Maryland Avenue. The project will remove 45 caliper inches of trees and proposes replacing 46 caliper inches. There will be a landscape planting strip on the north side of the project, two levels above grade, which will act as a buffer for the neighbors to the north. The applicant is proposing the use of bamboo at grade on a five foot wide strip at the north of the parking garage. Street trees will be planted along Central and Maryland for the hotel portion and a hedge will act as screening for the hotel drop off turn around. A total of 390 parking spaces are proposed on-site. The parking garage will provide 87 spaces of public parking and 303 spaces in support of the hotel and retail elements. Additionally, 85 spaces are being provided in the hotel/residential building for the condominium units. HDR Engineering, Inc. performed a parking study and concluded that “the total number of parking stalls provided as part of this project should be sufficient to meet the needs of all parties.” The parking scenario meets the Zoning Ordinance for uses (Please see Attachment A). Staff concurs that the parking meets the Zoning Ordinance requirements and is adequate for the project. The developer has agreed to install streetscape per Public Works Standards. There will be a minimal negative impact on traffic as a result of this project per Crawford, Bunte & Brammeier (CBB), as follows:

“Once complete, the proposed development is anticipated to have a nominal impact on operating conditions.”

The traffic study also considered the impact of traffic as a result of the project to the residential neighborhood to the north, as follows:

“The proposed development would add an additional 20 vph north on Central Avenue during both the morning and evening peak hours. The additional trips account for an

approximate increase of 10% in traffic north along this section of Central Avenue. Consequently, the increase in traffic attributable to this development would not be significant and would have a nominal impact upon the residential neighborhood to the north of the CBD area.”

Additionally, the Traffic Study reviewed the Forecasted Operating Conditions and had the following comments and recommendations.

“Accordingly, the proposed entrance on Maryland Avenue (two lanes, one lane inbound and one lane outbound) was evaluated and was found to have acceptable levels of service when evaluated as an isolated intersection. However, it should be noted that the queues along Maryland Avenue that obstruct the current drive would remain and consequently, would cause delays for the site’s traffic to complete left-turns in/out of the site. As a means of reducing queuing on Maryland Avenue associated with vehicles turning left into the site, it is recommended that the valet employ an alternate route when returning to the hotel from the garage during peak times. Specifically, it is recommended that the valet proceed south on Central Avenue, make a right into the alley and continue to proceed around the block to the site entrance via a series of right turns. A review of the adjacent intersections indicates that there is ample capacity to accommodate the additional turning movements that would result from this route. Furthermore, this route would reduce queues and increase safety along Maryland Avenue during the peak periods.”

Finally, the Traffic Study considered on-site circulation and concluded that while none of the issues constitutes a major deficiency that alternatives and signage could be considered to ease confusion. The study pointed out that the larger delivery trucks will not be able to access the loading doc and that the size of the trucks will be limited to WB-40.

Staff believes the site plan adequately handles drainage issues, ingress and egress situations and landscaping. The Traffic Study indicates nominal impact on traffic related to this project.

Staff recommends approval of the site plan with the following conditions:

1. MSD Approval of storm water mitigation; and
2. Developer must install street trees per Public Works approval; and
3. Other conditions as contained in the PUD Memo; and
4. All mitigations recommended by the Traffic Study.

Architectural Review: Consideration of a request for the design and materials associated with a two-phase mixed-use development at the subject properties. Phase I will consist of a 6-level parking structure with a two—story commercial component fronting Maryland Avenue. Three levels will be above grade. Phase II will consist of a 23-story hotel and condominium tower with first floor retail. Phase I of the proposed project will be located on property which currently contains the City’s parking lot at 103 North Central, parking dedicated to the 25 North Central building at 111 North Central, and parking for the adjacent St. Joseph’s Church at 119 North

Central. Phase II of the project will be located on property which currently contains a 5-story office building with ground floor retail/commercial uses.

Phase I: Garage/Commercial Structure

The proposed structure will measure approximately 39-feet in height from average existing grade to the top of the limestone façade. The parking garage portion of the building will be less in height, which staff estimated will be approximately 30-feet from finished grade to the top of the brick wall. Three levels of parking above grade are proposed with the remaining three levels placed below-grade. The garage will accommodate parking for 390 vehicles. The square footage of the garage area is 150,044. Fronting Maryland Avenue will be a commercial component occupying two stories totaling 18,420 square feet.

The exterior will contain two primary materials: limestone panels, and brick veneer.

The limestone panels are proposed for the “front” of the building consisting of the commercial area. Storefront windows with large mesh fabric awnings are shown above the storefront entrances. The laminate rain screen panel presented at the conceptual review has been replaced with brick veneer.

The openings of the garage will replicate windows on the east elevation. The plans show horizontal stone bands between each row of openings. The rendering indicates that cables will function as a vehicle stop mechanism; however, this detail is not shown on the elevation drawings. As currently shown, parked vehicles will be visible from Central and Maryland.

The north elevation will contain a brick veneer retaining wall used for a raised planter area to serve as a buffer from the residential area to the north.

On the west elevation, a brick veneer retaining wall is proposed to screen the garage ventilation wells; otherwise most of this elevation is open to allow for ventilation. A concrete barrier is proposed to screen the top parking level. The front of the elevation, which will be the most visible from Maryland, will contain primarily brick veneer with storefront windows at the corner.

The applicant is proposing the installation of City Streetscape along North Central and Maryland Avenues. In addition, a recessed patio area to be utilized for outdoor dining is proposed along Maryland Avenue.

Signage facing Maryland is shown in front of the awning mounted on a horizontal sign bar. This design is very similar to the existing signs on The Crescent mixed-use building. Signage is shown on the plans on the east and south elevations at the top of the third floor depicting an additional tenant. These signs have not been reviewed for compliance with the Sign Ordinance and should be considered as conceptual at this time. A sign package should be submitted for formal review and approval by the ARB at a later date.

Phase II: Hotel/Condominium Tower with Ground Floor Retail

The proposed hotel/condominium tower will measure approximately 280-feet in height containing 23 stories. The plans indicate 225 hotel rooms will be located on 12 floors and 40 condominium units will be located on the upper 7 floors. Two additional levels are proposed for ancillary hotel

uses such as a lobby, gift shop, restaurant, and meeting rooms. Parking for 80 spaces to serve the condominium units is provided below the building. The ground floor of the building will contain 5,880 square feet of ground floor retail is shown on the south side of the building. The northeast corner of the building shows a landscape hedge to screen the vehicle drop-off. Also shown on this corner is a small plaza with an art piece.

The base of the building contains brick and limestone panels. Large awnings are shown on this portion of the building at the street entrances. Limestone “fins” are proposed at regular intervals which separate the storefront entrances. The upper portion of the hotel contains a step back beginning at the fourth floor level. The primary material for the remainder of the building will be storefront windows and limestone panels. The condo units will contain a balcony consisting of pipe railings and horizontal cables.

The applicant is proposing the installation of City Streetscape along North Central and Maryland Avenues.

Signage facing Maryland and N. Central is shown on a sign band. The details of this signage have not been provided and, as is the case with the parking garage, a sign package should be submitted for formal review and approval by the ARB at a later date.

These two buildings will have a dramatic effect on this area of the Central Business District (CBD). The hotel tower will have a considerable presence among other high-rise buildings in the Clayton CBD and the parking garage will replace surface lots on North Central.

The building portion of the garage structure facing Maryland represents an attractive design incorporating limestone panels and a patio area for use by the retail tenants. The revised design on the N. Central elevation is an improvement from the last proposal. However, staff has concerns with the screening of the vehicles in the garage. The openings have increased and there is nothing screening the view of the automobiles from N. Central. Furthermore, the west elevation is very open without much screening. Staff realizes this is due to ventilation requirements; however, the result is a very open garage.

The main design elements of the hotel tower represent a unique addition to the skyline; however, staff is concerned about the lower level of the design as it meets the street-level. Based on the drawings submitted, the building at Maryland and North Central does not appear to address the corner appropriately for a project of this magnitude. Additionally, the hedge row proposed at the corner to screen the internal drop-off area, by itself, is not sufficient for such a prominent location. Staff recommends a redesign of certain elements of the project as follows:

1. Adding screening for the garage openings to diminish the appearance of automobiles from the structure. As an alternative, the developer could minimize the window area and sprinkler the garage to meet ventilation requirements.
2. Incorporating more interest at the lower levels of the northeast corner of the hotel tower and pedestrian plaza area.

Mr. Stephens presented a slide depicting a rendering of the garage. He explained that the “skin” of the garage along Central Avenue has been changed back to a window design (rain screen

material has been removed from the proposal) and that the northwest wall has been raised so as to block the view of the parked vehicles.

Chairman Sanger asked the distance between the condominium building and the garage.

Mr. Stephens replied “about 18 feet”. He stated the sidewalk has been removed and the area replaced with bamboo. A slide depicting the shadows was presented, as well as a slide depicting the height comparison with that of the church building. He commented that it is better now that the garage is two stories on that elevation versus the previously proposed three stories. A slide depicting the height comparison with that of the Graybar building was presented. A rendering of the hotel was presented. Mr. Stephens mentioned that Central Avenue represents a small scale pedestrian environment whereas Maryland Avenue represents a heavy scale vehicular environment. He stated their goal was to connect the two buildings.

Chairman Sanger asked the materials of the hotel.

Mr. Stephens indicated it is cast stone and brick. A slide depicting Washington University garage was presented, depicting the 30’ open spans (column to column). Mr. Stephens indicated that they wanted this garage to be more residential-like and that they have incorporated 10’ open spans. He stated the open garage will allow for natural ventilation, whereas a closed garage would require a sprinkler system and mechanical ventilation. A slide depicting the proposed garage was presented. Mr. Stephens stated that the cars are recessed back in the shadow, which he believes is more in keeping with the residential character. A slide depicting the inside and outside lobbies was presented.

Chairman Sanger asked if the front lobby lines up with the buildings to the south.

Mr. Stephens replied “no”; he stated it is set back 18 feet.

Catherine Powers advised the members that the last pictures are far more detailed than the plans and suggests soliciting questions or comments from the Plan Commission and then the audience.

Steve Lichtenfeld commented that at night, vehicle headlights as well as the garage ceiling lighting can be seen outside the Washington University garage.

Mr. Stephens stated that their garage has much more solid area than that of the Washington University garage. He stated that there will be some glow, but the lights will not shine out of the “holes”.

Chairman Sanger asked if a portion of the first floor of the garage is underground.

Mr. Stephens replied “yes”.

Steve Lichtenfeld stated that he is very concerned about headlights and garage lighting spillover. He stated that the garage does not seem to transition to the residential area to the north. He asked if the garage height has been lowered.

Mr. Stephens replied “no”.

Steve Lichtenfeld stated that previously, there was no parking over the retail.

Mr. Stephens indicated that is correct.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked how many cars can be parked over the retail portion of the garage.

Mr. Stephens replied 20 to 22.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked if the garage is higher on the north side than it was previously.

Mr. Stephens replied “yes”. He stated the wall was raised so the cars could not be seen from that elevation.

Steve Lichtenfeld stated his concern with the spreading of the bamboo.

Mr. Stephens stated the bamboo was suggested by the landscape architect.

Steve Lichtenfeld stated that his experience is that bamboo is not able to be contained. He stated that although he understands the safety aspect of its use, he would prefer not using bamboo.

Jim Liberman commented that he does not believe there is enough detail on the plans to approve the architectural issues as there is no good sense of detail, especially for the hotel portion of the project. He stated the change to brick is better, and that the project is moving in the right direction, but that more detail is needed for the railing system and storefront glass system. He then asked if the change from limestone to cast stone was done recently.

Mr. Stephens replied “yes”.

Scott Wilson indicated that he agrees with Steve Lichtenfeld regarding the concern about glow of lighting from the garage. He stated the hotel will forever change the streetscape of the CBD.

Mr. Stephens reminded the members that they were not in favor of the previously proposed garage screening.

Steve Lichtenfeld stated he has no issue with the concept of the PUD in that it seems to function; however, he believes other elements of the project (SPR, ARB) have problems and need further review and consideration.

Note: Kevin O’Keefe left the meeting (7:00 p.m.).

Mr. Matt Geekie, Deputy General Counsel of Graybar Electric, advised the members that Graybar is opposed to the project and that the property owned by the church was rezoned conditionally. He stated that there is a concern with regard to the lighting from the garage and that this project will have an immediate negative impact on Graybar’s property. He stated Graybar has been at this location since 1983, is a Fortune 500 company and believes to be an asset to Clayton.

He stated they are attempting to lease out their 5th floor but cannot, due to this impending project. Mr. Geekie stated that it is incumbent on the Plan Commission/ARB to consider Section 2.21, Page 9, of the City's CBD Master Plan with regard to density which reads as follows "Density is important to the CBD and the retail/mixed use core and can be translated into more people and greater amounts of physical and economic vitality. Density, however, does not necessitate towers." "The core area should be characterized by lower rise development which preserves light, vistas and ensures a pedestrian scale setting." "Building heights should maximize the development opportunity without jeopardizing the pedestrian environment and quality of place." Mr. Geekie then pointed out upcoming developments such as Brown Shoe, Montgomery Bank and Centene. He stated that attempting to cross pedestrians across Maryland Avenue jeopardizes safety. He stated the area is intended to be a low-rise pedestrian area.

Mr. Merwin Sher, 7816 Pershing, stated that it is a beautiful building, but that the project does not remind him of "home". He stated that food delivery trucks park in the middle of the street and that it will be impossible to turn into the docking area from the alley. He stated he finds it difficult to believe that there will only be a 10% increase in traffic as a result of this project.

Catherine Powers stated that the traffic report refers to trucks no larger than a WB40.

Mr. Sher commented that due to increased gas prices, trucks are getting larger, not smaller.

Mr. Tom Stern, President of Solon Gershman (7 N. Bemiston Ave.) stated his company manages and leases the building at 25 N. Central (hotel site) as well as others between Forsyth and Maryland. He stated his company supports the proposal and compliments the City and the Church for its support.

Mr. Andy Zinsmeyer, 167 N. Central Ave., stated he walks from his home to his office. He stated there is a problem with parking and an increase in traffic on Central. He stated that there are four lanes capable of entering and exiting the garage and that this would change the area.

Chairman Sanger asked the capacity of the current parking lot.

Jason Jaggi indicated that information would have to be researched.

Chairman Sanger stated he assumes it is a destination hotel.

Mr. Stephens agreed. He stated it is not a vacation type hotel, serving mostly business travelers. He reminded the members that the condominium owners will not park in the garage, but in the hotel building.

Catherine Powers advised the members that the lots currently provide a total of 132 parking spaces.

Mr. Stephens reiterated that professional traffic and parking studies were conducted.

Mr. Rick Meyer, 139 N. Central Ave., stated that the valet parking service could be used rather than the hotel parking.

Chairman Sanger commented that the garage will provide public parking.

Mr. Jim Mellow, Armstrong-Teasdale, stated that the public parking will be hourly or leased; the same as other City parking.

Mr. Meyer stated he anticipates that more people will want to park in the residential area. He questions if more parking is actually needed. He suggested shuttling hotel guests from the Metro garage. He asked if an occupancy study has been performed on other Clayton hotels.

Chairman Sanger stated that would be an issue for the developer.

Mr. Meyer suggested marking the parking on North Central permit parking only.

Lenore Toser-Aldaz indicated that a resident survey could be conducted to determine parking restrictions north of the proposed project.

Ms. Suzie Forsyth, 159 N. Central Ave., stated she is disappointed with the fact that there is a change in zoning that will impose on a residential area. She stated that this project was not right in 1988 and that it is not right now and not the desire of the residents on that street. She stated her main objection is that the lot owned by the church should not be included in the project.

Chairman Sanger asked why the church lot is so important.

Ms. Forsyth replied that it is important is because it is zoned R-3, residential.

Mr. Jimmy Turner, 139 N. Central Ave., stated he supports Mr. Meyer's concern about parking and that the street is full of cars most of the day and there is no traffic control at night. He stated he guarantees that there will not be a place to park on North Central. He asked for permit parking on North Central.

Ms. Kathy Beilein, 108 North Bemiston, stated she is pro-development, but that the magnitude of this project is not right for the area. She referred to staff's comment that the project is in compliance with the Master Plan and asked if Action Area #2 stretches north of Maryland.

Catherine Powers indicated that the site zoned R-3 would be excluded.

Ms. Beilein indicated that the document she has only includes the area south of Maryland. She asked if the hotel could stand alone without the parking.

Catherine Powers replied "no".

Ms. Beilein asked if this is considered a unified development even though there is a street in between.

Catherine Powers stated that by definition, the sites do not have to be adjacent.

Ms. Beilein asked if there are any other 24 hour operations north of Maryland.

Catherine Powers stated the current parking is available 24 hours.

Ms. Beilein stated that her biggest concern is the size of the project and that former Plan Commission Chairman, John Porter, stated that larger buildings should remain within the interior of the CBD so as to not encroach on residents.

Chairman Sanger read a portion of the section of the Master Plan that was not previously read by Mr. Geekie, as follows: "The low rise core would be surrounded by towers, physically defining this pedestrian center."

Ms. Laura Turner, 139 N. Central Ave., asked how many cars will back up at the traffic signal.

Mr. Stephens indicated that information is contained in the Traffic Study. He stated a solution to that situation would be to place the driveway closer to the residential area, but he knows the residents would not like that. He reiterated that an expert in traffic was hired to perform the traffic study.

Ms. Turner indicated that those individuals who park on North Central throw trash on the street. She, too, asked for permit parking on North Central.

Mr. Jim Kerley, 139 N. Central Ave., commented that if valet parking is used, the drivers will have to wait through four traffic lights to park the vehicles; he has a difficult time believing that they will be willing to do that and that he believes the drivers will find a quicker route. He asked for a financial feasibility study.

Mr. Jim Mellow, 6306 Alexander and representative of RJ York, commented that the concern about the valet only applies to the return trip. He stated that taller buildings are acceptable through the PUD process. He stated this project will provide two times more parking for the public than what is currently available, which will reduce the stress of available parking. He stated the project includes the City lot that should be more intensely used.

Mr. Geekie stated that Graybar has been in that location since 1983 and that the Master Plan was adopted 10 years later. He stated a project could be 5 or 6 stories without resorting to a tower building.

Ms. Beilein stated that the project will result in an increase in parking and traffic.

Chairman Sanger commented that Crawford, Bunte & Brammeier (CBC) is an independent traffic consultant.

Mr. Kent Chapin, 148 N. Central Ave., stated that the scale of this project completely changes North Central and that it does not fit the character of the neighborhood and takes away pedestrian space. He stated this project is a mistake and asked the Board to listen to the citizens of the area, including Graybar. He asked that the project be put somewhere else.

Mr. Stephens commented that the height of the hotel is the same as that of the Pierre LaClede building.

Mr. Kerley asked that the project proceed slowly as it will have a huge impact on the area.

Chairman Sanger called for a 7 minute break at 8:23 p.m.

The meeting resumed at 8:30 p.m.

Chairman Sanger called for a motion to close the public hearing.

Steve Lichtenfeld made a motion to close the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Scott Wilson and unanimously approved by the Commission.

Chairman Sanger thanked the public for their input. He called for comments from the members.

Steve Lichtenfeld stated that this is the first crucial project where residential meets commercial. He agreed that we have to move more slowly as this could set a precedent. He stated that there is a density issue as referred to in the Master Plan and that he believes in an urban area the opposite is true: high rises should be in the core and shorter buildings on the outer edge.

Jim Liberman stated he is not comfortable with the completeness of the architectural aspects of the project and that he, too, is more comfortable with the higher buildings in the central core. He then referred to the Trianon Project and the request to relocate the higher building away from Forsyth.

Chairman Sanger stated that a lot of time was spent in 1993 when the CBD Master Plan was prepared. He stated in reality, things are different as environments change. He stated he is personally okay with the hotel as it is in the CBD, but has issues with the traffic patterns and flows related to the garage. He stated that overall, he likes the project and what it brings to Clayton, but that he wants less of an impact on the residential neighborhood. He asked staff what options are available.

Catherine Powers stated that the Commission can vote on or continue any or all of the components as listed on the agenda. She stated if the Commission chooses to table any of the items, some direction needs to be given to the applicant and to staff. She reminded the members that the PUD portion of the project goes before the Board of Aldermen for final determination, but that the site plan and architectural review decisions lie completely with this Commission/Board. She stated that if the PUD portion of the approval is voted affirmatively, that portion could be forwarded on to the Board of Aldermen or could be held until the entire project approvals (SPR, ARB) are received.

Chairman Sanger asked if the PUD receives a positive recommendation this evening, if the project is deemed acceptable in general terms.

Catherine Powers indicated that if the PUD is voted on affirmatively by this Commission, the density, height and uses are deemed acceptable in general terms. She reminded the members that there is a 60 day time limit on approval if a waiver submitted by the applicant is not received.

Jason Jaggi commented that he believes the time limit begins from today's date, as the Site Plan and ARB aspects were previously on the agenda as conceptual review only.

Catherine Powers asked for direction from the Commission members.

Chairman Sanger commented that if the hotel was shorter, less parking would be required and if the garage were shortened and moved further away from the residential area, that would be beneficial, although he does not know if that is possible.

Scott Wilson asked how short is short enough. He stated in general terms, he agrees with the proposal and questions if peace will ever be found with the neighborhood residents.

Steve Lichtenfeld stated that this project will truly set a precedent.

Chairman Sanger commented that the garage is not an attractive use of the property.

Steve Lichtenfeld referred to the difference in the zoning of the lots.

Catherine Powers stated that the City owned lot is zoned C-2.

Steve Lichtenfeld mentioned the middle lot, zoned R-3, which is deeded to the Frank building and the third lot deeded to the church.

Being no further questions or comments, Steve Lichtenfeld made a motion to table the PUD to a date uncertain, but within the 60 day time limit. The motion was seconded by Jim Liberman and received the following voice call vote: Ayes: Chairman Sanger, Steve Lichtenfeld, Lenore Toser-Aldaz and Jim Liberman. Nays: Scott Wilson.

Steve Lichtenfeld made a motion to table the site plan review of this project. The motion was seconded by Jim Liberman and received the following voice call vote: Ayes: Chairman Sanger, Steve Lichtenfeld, Lenore Toser-Aldaz and Jim Liberman. Nays: Scott Wilson.

Jim Liberman made a motion to table the architectural review aspects of the project. The motion was seconded by Steve Lichtenfeld and unanimously approved by the Board.

Chairman Sanger suggested that the applicant discuss the options with staff. He reminded the applicant that the City would love to see a development, but that it has to be right for the residents. He asked that something be done about the traffic patterns.

Being no further business for the Plan Commission/Architectural Review Board, this meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

Recording Secretary